

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

een

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/701,947	11/04/2003	Ross W. Callon	IBN.5202C1	7124
24739 CENTRAL CO	7590 06/05/2007	EXAMINER		
CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY, INC 3 HANGAR WAY SUITE D			ABELSON, RONALD B	
WATSONVIL	LE, CA 95076		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			2616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	06/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/701,947	CALLON ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Ronald Abelson	2616			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC  .136(a). In no event, however, may a re d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT ate. cause the application to become ABA	ATION. Day be timely filed  HS from the mailing date of this communication. INDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133)			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04	November 2003.				
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Th	is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal matte	rs, prosecution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are pending in the application	n.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 November 2003</u> is/		objected to by the Examiner			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		<del>-</del>			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		• •			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	,				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigna) All b) Some * c) None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority documen	nts have been received				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price	*				
application from the International Burea	•				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis		eceived.			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Su				
2)		Mail Date  mal Patent Application			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04 November 2003</u> .	6)  Other:	·			

Application/Control Number: 10/701,947

Art Unit: 2616

## Double Patenting

Page 2

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co., 151 U.S. 186 (1894); In re Ockert, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

- 2. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-18 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,643,287. This is a double patenting rejection.
- The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 2616

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 19-37 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 19-37 of U.S. Patent No. 6,643,287. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference in the wording of independent claim 19 in the application and the patent do not change the scope of the limitations.

## Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald Abelson whose telephone number is (571) 272-3165. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham can be reached on (571) 272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization

Application/Control Number: 10/701,947 Page 4

Art Unit: 2616

where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ronald Abelson
Examiner
Art Unit 2616

\* \* \*